

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action mailed May 5, 2003, in which a restriction requirement was made, and a Preliminary Amendment.

Applicant provisionally elects the claims in Group II and Species B thereof, with traverse.

Original apparatus claims 1-22 are essentially parallel to original method claims 36-57. Therefore, these apparatus and method claims are not directed to independent and distinct inventions, and do not require a separate search. Accordingly, Applicant submits that restriction should not be required between these apparatus and method claims.

New apparatus claims 69-101 are based on original apparatus claim 1, and new method claims 102-133 are based on original method claim 36. Accordingly, while method claims 102-133 are consistent with Applicant's provisional election, it is submitted that apparatus claims 69-101 should be examined as well.

Respectfully submitted,



William A. Birdwell
Reg. No. 27,181
Of Attorneys for Applicant

PrelimAmendFINAL.wpd